REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application, indicating that the drawings filed on December 9, 2003 are accepted, acknowledging the claim for foreign priority, and receipt of all certified copies of the priority documents. Further, Applicant thanks the Examiner for withdrawing the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Disposition of the Claims

Claims 39-75 are pending in this application. Claims 39, 53, 55, and 62 are independent. The remaining claims depend directly or indirectly from claims 39, 53, 55, and 62.

Request for Examiner Interview

Applicant respectfully requests an Examiner Interview to discuss the referenced application at a date and time convenient for all parties. An Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form is attached to this reply.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 39-75 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,349,355 ("Draves") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,948,097 ("Glew"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

"To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness "...the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." (*See* MPEP §2143.03). Further,

"all words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art. " (*See* MPEP §2143.03). The Applicant respectfully asserts that the cited references, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 39, 53, 55, and 62. Specifically, independent claims 39, 53, 55, and 62 require, in part, the following:

(i) determining whether the memory address is in the privileged region of memory in response to a request, and

(ii) switching the system to privileged mode if the memory address is determined to be in the privileged region of memory.

As stated by the Examiner, Draves does not disclose the aforementioned limitations (*See* Office Action dated December 21, 2006, page 3). Further, Glew does not teach or suggest that which Draves lacks. First, the portion of Glew relied upon by the Examiner is completely silent with respect to determining whether the memory address is in the privileged region of memory in response to a request. (*See* Office Action dated December 21, 2006, page 3-4 and Glew, col. 5 ll. 54 - col. 6 ll.5). Rather, the portion recited by the Examiner only discloses that non-privileged code stores a data value, which represents a print function, in memory and makes a call to "SYSENTER" in a library ("common user code"). However, Glew does not disclose where the data value is stored (*i.e.*, in a privileged or non-privileged region of memory). In fact, the storage of the data value in memory is the only mention of memory in the portion of Glew relied upon by the Examiner. Because the only item stored in memory is the data value and Glew does not disclose where it is stored, Glew cannot disclose determining whether a memory address is in a privileged region or non-privileged region of memory.

Further, Glew only teaches determining whether the user code is authorized to use the print function based on a user privilege level and the name of the function, without any mention of basing the aforementioned determination on a memory address as required by the independent claims (*See, e.g.*, Glew col. 5, ll. 28-29, col. 6, ll. 1-5).

Moreover, Glew would not even need to contemplate determining whether the memory address is in a privileged or non-privileged region of memory as the invocation of the SYSENTER call, and not the location of memory address, causes the execution to be transferred to the privileged operating system kernel code (*See, e.g.*, Glew col. 5, ll. 34-36).

Thus, Glew may not be used to teach or suggest determining whether the memory address is in the privileged region of memory in response to a request as recited in claims 39, 53, 55, and 62.

In addition, Glew fails to teach or suggest switching the system to privileged mode if the memory address is determined to be in the privileged region of memory. Specifically, the portion of Glew relied upon by the Examiner merely teaches switching execution to privileged code. (*See* Office Action dated December 21, 2006, page 3-4 and Glew col. 2 ll. 34-38). The only switch to privilege code taught by Glew is based on a System Call and a SYSENTER function, without any mention of determining whether the memory address is in the privilege region of memory as required by the claims of the present invention. Accordingly, Glew may not be used to teach the aforementioned limitation.

In view of the above, Draves and Glew, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent claims 39, 53, 55, and 62. Dependent claims 40-52, 54, 56-61, and 63-75 are allowable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 03226/368001; P7878).

Dated: March 21, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

#L0031

By _____ ALY DOSSA

Robert P. Lord
Registration No.: 46,479
OSHA · LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant

Attachment (Interview Request Form)